

A BRIEF
EXAMINATION
OF THE
Bishop of CORK's
DISCOURSE,
OF
Drinking to the Memory
OF THE
D E A D.

By a COUNTRY-CURATE
of IRELAND.

L O N D O N,

Printed for J. ROBERTS, near the Oxford-
Arms in Warwick-Lane. 1714. Price 6d.

AN ABSTRACT
OF THE
HISTORY OF COCK
DISCOVERED
OF
Bringing to the Memory
OF THE
DEAD

By a Country-Curate
of IRELAND.

L O N D O N :
Printed for J. Roberts, near the Old-
Church in Warwick Lane. 1714. Price 6s.

C
Re
H
CO
You
Par
beg
with
una
his
W
You
gav
the
retu
but
as l

i

TO THE
LOWER-HOUSE
OF
CONVOCATION.

Reverend SIRs,

HAVING heard, with what Solemnity, you were pleas'd, to give your publick Thanks to the Right Reverend Author, for the DISCOURSE, of which I here presume to lay before You my private Thoughts : -I cannot tell ; how the Parable of the Lost Sheep came into my Mind ; I began to think, how the Good Man was transported with Joy, when he found the poor Creature ; and unable to contain the flowing Passion, gave Notice to his Friends, to come and rejoyce with him.

When One deserted Your Committee, and gave Your Resolutions into wicked Hands, You, alas ! gave him for lost. (For I take You to be in Effect the same House with the former.) But he no sooner returns with these genuine Fruits of Repentance ; but You congratulate each other, and embrace him, as having merited, by going astray.

'Tis thought indeed, You admire not so much the Work, consider'd simply, or in it self; as the happy Change of Mind, so legible in it.

But, if You misapprehending, as 'tis said, the good Service design'd the Church, by that Semblance of Perfidy, (and which was rightly understood by the Pious L—d W—t—n) reproach'd and condemn'd him without Reason. 'Tis but just (if You took this Occasion) to Approve and Applaud what he has done amiss for the same Reason; because it may be the Privilege of the Chair to blow hot and cold.

Here indeed are some bumerous Fallacies and pretty Flirts of Ill Nature, suitable to the Genius of the Times. But here are also, (under the Rose be it spoken) many other things said, not very Pious, nor very Orthodox. As, that bare Drinking to the Memory of a Person dead, is the most profound Mystery of the Gospel, and the Foundation of our whole Christianity, pag. 10, 27, 29, 41. That it is become in it self, and in its own Nature, a Sacramental Action, now under the Gospel, tho' done neither in the same Manner, nor towards the same Object, nor with the same Circumstances. The Wine not consecrated, &c. Yet being so done, is also in it self sinful; now under the Gospel. That of all other Actions in this Sacrament, this one only of drinking Wine, has Christ chosen to himself, to perpetuate the Remembrance of him, Pag. 26. And tho' it be repeated Ten Thousand a Million of Times, where and how you please; 'tis the same Action still. That very one single Action,

DEDICATION. iii

Action, consecrated to the Memory of Christ, p. 28. That the very Essence of the Eucharistical Sacrifice consists in that Action, p. 8. *As to the other Sacrament of Baptism, That the Essence of that does not consist in baptizing Persons with Water, In the Name of the Father, &c. according to the Doctrine of our Church; but in the Admission of Persons into a Visible Body. P. 15.*

Two or Three of us, poor Country Curates, having read and ponder'd these Things in our Thoughts, we were at first doubtful, whether some new Revelations might not have been made to his Lordship, which, You assembled together, might also have had communicated to you, unknown to us; and if not, whether your Time was not so much taken up with Cares, which more nearly concern'd your Copy-Holds; that you had not Leisure or Opportunity to read or examine this Treatise. However, after some short Pause, reasoning more closely of the Matter, we thought our selves able to sole the Phenomenon, and satisfy our own Consciences.

Yet, I find some splenetic, tho' sincere Christians are not inclin'd to make Allowances for those secular Diversions, where the Honour of Truth, and Religion is concern'd; and can hardly be dissuaded from suspecting your Authority, as the Church Representative, in Matters of Faith, and Christian Doctrine.

*They have heard, they say, of pack'd Councils, and of the Infallible Spirit, coming on Occasion from Rome in a Cloak-bag. These Things have made them suspicious, I'm afraid, beyond Remedy: So
That*

that when they see a Man distinguish himself by nothing but Words full of Zeal for the Church, they cannot forbear throwing a Cardinal's Cap in his Teeth. I cannot therefore hit upon a more effectual Way, (tho' it be somewhat too Christian) to dispossess 'em of these Prejudices, and give the World a Specimen of somewhat like Sincerity; than by publicly Revoking your Thanks, and to remove the great Offence given Us Little Ones, Authoritatively require his Lordship to Recant and Abjure these Positions as Impious and Heretical. For I have no more Reason to be concern'd for the main Argument than any of you.

But, if he rather chuses, like the good old Bishop, to stick to his Romantick Whimsie, and out of Paternal Affection undertake the Guardianship and Defence of it; let him by no means want any Assistance in so momentous an Affair.

And because the Rosicrucian Principles do more than Ancillari Theologiæ Misticæ, it is in my Opinion advisable, with the Jewish Cabala, to consult Parocellus, Vanhelmont, and other great Adepts: Or instead of them all, the living Oracle of all Unintelligible Sciences, the Reverend Member who first mov'd the House to Conn his Lordship Thanks, Mr. J—n C—l—n, D—n of K—d—e. For these, I conceive, will be much more serviceable in this Controversie, than the Scriptures, or Councils, or Fathers.

The Method I have taken to come at the Truth in this Dispute, and set the Author's Errors, and Fallacies

DEDICATION.

lacies, as I take them to be, (not Myfterious) in the open Light, is,

- I. *To confider the true State of the Question, and clear it of all Profaneness and Ambiguity.*
- II. *To weigh the Force of his pretended Arguments, for the Affirmative of the Question, as he calls it, and shew how weak and inclusive they are.*
- III. *And lastly, observe with all possible Deference to his Lordship's Character, one or two Things, by way of Inference, from the Air and Tendency of the whole Discourse: Not doubting of your Favour, so far as I have Truth on my Side, and you a Zeal for nothing else.*

But be the Success what it will, this I make bold to say for my self with all Christian Sincerity, That I have not taken upon me to oppose his Lordship for the Laurel, so much in Fashion, nor to recommend my self to the Genius of the Age, for Promotion.

These Views I freely give up to my Lord, and the Polite Divines, who flutter in soft Raiment about King's Palaces. For I am a Christian, and contend only for the Truth and Honour of what, I as really believe, as I publicly profess. In the Defence of which I am ready to suffer, and (if it be the Will of God) to die.

THE

DEDICATION

lucid, as I take them to be, (not Mythenes) in
the open light, is

I. To consider the true State of the Question, and
clear it of all Propriety and Ambiguity.

II. To weigh the Force of his pretended Arguments, for the Affirmative of the Question, as he calls it, and then how weak and untrue they are.

III. And lastly, observe with all possible Diffidence to his Lordship's Character, one or two Things, by way of Instruction, from the Air and Temper of of the whole Discourse: Not doubting of your Honour, so far as I have Truth on my Side, and you a Seal for nothing else.

But be the Success what it will, this I make bold to say for my self, with all Christian Sincerity, that I have not taken upon me to oppose his Lordship for the I must so much in Religion, nor to recommend my self to the Genius of the Age, for Promotion. These Errors I freely give up to my Lord, and the Politicians, who flatter in lost Raiment about King's Palaces. For I am a Christian, and content only for the Truth and Honour of what I as really believe, as I publicly profess. In the Defence of which I am ready to suffer, and (if it be the Will of God) to die.

THE

A Brief EXAMINATION of the Bishop of Cork's Discourse, &c.

Of the State of the Question.

“THE Question I am now to speak to, says
“the Bishop, is this:
“Whether Drinking to the Memory of the Dead,
“excepting only to the Memory of Jesus Christ, is
“an Action in it self Sinful, now under the Gospel? And,
“Whether the Custom of Drinking to the Memory of a de-
“parted Monarch is so in particular?” Which is at least
Two Questions in expresse Terms; One in *Thesis*, the
Other in *Hypothesis*. For tho’ One may be implied in
the Other, as several Particulars are in one General
Notion; yet one with distinguishing Circumstances
in Morality, and expressely mentioned, must be allowed
somewhat different from the common Croud of Par-
ticulars. There may indeed have been but One in his
Intention; which if it can be put out of Countenance,
he cares not what becomes of the Other that’s made
to stalk before it.

This Question, it seems, he is now to speak to: It
was not seasonable before; and his Lordship, as all
other Wise Men, does every Thing in its proper Time,
tho’ he be no Time-server. Who says he is? ’Tis true;
he might have spoke to it, when the young Master of
Arts was degraded for Drinking to the Pious Memory

of *Bals*, as an Affront to the Memory of *K. William* : but *then* was not *now*, nor the Truth self-evident, but lay snug and dormant till the *Thanksgiving-Day* for the Peace ; and then it awoke to Judgment, to the Confusion of all who drank the execrable *Health* : Yet was kept in Lavender till the Fourth of *November* last, when it appear'd with Terror to the Clergy call'd together, not to damn the Nation till the Moment the Way was clear to *Armagh*.

And he proposes modestly only to speak to it, being ashamed, as he would have us believe, to make a Question of a *Self-evident Truth*, did not the present Wickedness and Impiety of some pretended Christians require it, i. e. make no Question of it. And therefore, to the great Mortification of all Men in their Senses, or who have a Reverence for holy Things, he very Casuistically resolves it in the Affirmative ; having first conceived it in such Words, as never Man did before, and which it never enter'd into the Heart of Man, except his own, to conceive : For,

First, He here, under Equivocal Terms, confounds Two Things, in their Nature as different as *Heaven* and *Earth*, and makes 'em but One ; I mean, *Drinking to the Memory* of any indifferent Person deceas'd ; and *Drinking* in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Remembrance of Our Blessed Lord. Which, I dare say, wou'd not be look'd upon in any One living, except his Lordship, as an Argument of the Sincerity of his Intentions, or of the Clearness of his Judgment, or of the Devotion of his Heart. For is *Drinking* (as for what I know, has been always Customary) to the Memory of Worthy Persons, when Dead, any thing more than a civil Respect paid 'em in such a way as they are capable of ? Is an *Health*, as we call it, any Thing more than a common *Form*, wherein we express our Esteem or Value of Persons, if present, by *Drinking* to their *Health* ; if *Absent* or *Dead*, to their Memory ? But *Drinking* of the Holy Cup in Remembrance

brance of Christ, (which ought not to be spoke of but with the greatest Veneration) according to his own positive Institution, is the most Solemn Act of the Christian Worship. But, what is there common in these Actions? What one Circumstance do they agree in, except the Matter, which is *Drinking*? — The Objects they are directed to, are very different; the Ends to which they are design'd, very different; the Manner wherein they are perform'd, very different; and, in a word, all other Circumstances. What then, in God's Name, can make 'em One? Has my Lord forgot, that Moral Actions, *Specificantur ab Objecto, & Fine Principali*, &c. tho' materially, or physically the same, become Good or Evil, according to the Intentions of the Agent; the Ends to which they are design'd; or the Object to which they are directed; with other Circumstances; and, therefore must be different, according to the Diversity of These.

Secondly, Therefore, in confounding these Actions, 'tis plain, he makes no Difference between Our Lord Jesus Christ, and any other Person dead: Not considering, that tho' Our Lord dy'd like other Men, yet continues not in the State of the Dead, like them; but being visibly Risen from the Dead, and taken up into Heaven, there Sits on the Right Hand of God.

Thirdly, Therefore, as Christ is here comprehended under the common Notion of a Person dead; so likewise of a meer Man: Which I believe his Lordship did not design; (yet, that he knows will not simply excuse for the Fact,) which is an impious Diminution of his Honour: For tho' He be perfect Man, He is God also; and now, that He's exalted and glorify'd in Heaven, to be consider'd and approach'd, as indeed He is, God. And therefore, to rank or conceive Him, as in the common Croud of Persons dead, is so far from becoming a Christian Bishop, that a poor Laick,

in pious Times, wou'd have suffer'd no small Penance for it.

Therefore, to speak my Thoughts very plainly, I cannot think the Question put in these Words, less prophane than the Expression of a certain Pretended Bishop, somewhat more near the Northern Pole than his Lordship; who celebrating this Sacrament, said to the next, o'er his Left Thumb, *Here, Brother; here's Remembring our Absent Friend, Jesus Christ.* Which Familiarity, the honest Lay-Man was so much offended at, that he immediately withdrew, without Pledging his Pastor, as I am inform'd: *If He be Absent,* said he, *I have no Business here.* Jesus Christ is God; and to turn the Sacrament into a prophane Health, or open a Way into the Minds of Carnal Persons, to consider or fancy it as such, is of such impious Consequence, and an Indication of so unsanctify'd an Imagination, as I am sure few good Christians will envy his Lordship the Credit of its Wit and Novelty.

I therefore beg Leave to lay the Exception aside; and that the Question may at present stand thus: *Whether the customary way of Drinking to the Memory of the Dead, is in it self sinful, now under the Gospel?* Yet here I must observe, that an Action in it self sinful, must have been so before the Gospel: For this does not alter the Nature of Moral Actions, nor make Actions *sinful in themselves*, which were not so before. But that this Action was not so in it self before the Gospel, I thus prove in his Lordship's Style.

Our Lord Jesus Christ never appropriated any Action in it self sinful, to Himself.

But, *He has appropriated the Action of Drinking to the Memory of the Dead, to his own Person; Ergo,* that Action is not in it self sinful. His Lordship knows this is a good Syllogism in Celarent; the Minor is his Lordship's, and the Major I fancy he'll not deny.

But,

But, to speak honestly, and to vulgar Capacities; I believe few Men in their Senses, therefore not my Lord, will maintain that the bare Action of Drinking, is in it self *sinful*; because natural or necessary; nor of Course, to tack a few harmless Words to it, to keep up Conversation and Friendship, or preserve the Memory of absent or deceas'd Friends in our Minds; such as *Here's to the Memory of — Not forgetting —*. For are not these Forms as inoffensive and unexceptionable, as visible Signs, Pictures, Statues, Poems, &c. which my Lord grants, may be lawfully us'd. And what if we shou'd add to these, as we think they deserve, the Characters of *Pious, Glorious, Immortal*, are they worse in an Health, than in an Ode, or Sermon, or Panagyrick?

And truly, abating the Rigor of the Solecism, this is suppos'd by the limiting Clause, *now under the Gospel*, which implies, the Action was not in it self *sinful* before the Gospel, or to them who are not under it, (more than, according to another profound Learned Man, their Souls were immortal) but made so by some positive Precept of the Gospel.

But as it is in it self no *sinful* Action, I am far from supposing it to be in it self Vertuous or Good — 'Tis plainly of those Actions, which are said to be in their own Nature indifferent; and only become Good or Bad as they happen to be circumstantiated. Thus, to Drink an Health (as 'tis call'd) in Memory of Queen Elizabeth, King Charles I. or King William III. as is usual, intending no more by it than to celebrate the Glories of their Reigns, the Benefits we derive from 'em, or their own Royal Personal Vertues, can be look'd upon as nothing worse than an Expression of Loyalty, and Gratitude, as far as Dead Princes have a Right to either; And therefore to condemn it, as an *Action in it self sinful*, as it can proceed from nothing more than a disorder'd Head, or a corrupt Heart; can be attended truly with no good Consequence, but

to fill weak Minds with Superstitious Fears; and if it were possible, hinder Posterity from celebrating Her present Majesty's Royal Vertues, and the Glories of Her Happy Reign. But this I no more suspect is my Lord's Intent, than that there will arise any Bishop in future Reigns, so void of Sense, or Piety, or Loyalty, as to revive his *Doctrine*.

On the contrary, to drink to the pious Memory of *Balf-er Sorrel* is a very impious Action. The former as signifying our Approbation of the Villain's Robberies, as equal in merit to the Victories of the Greatest General of his Age; the other, because contrary to all the Sentiments of Honour and Humanity, they rejoice in that unhappy Accident which hasten'd the Death of a Great Prince; and ascribe Merit to a very Brute, tho' not so Brutal, as they who *drink it*. My Lord indeed did once, as it became his Character, with just Resentment punish the Person, who first in Contempt of the *Glorious Memory* propos'd the former, nor will any one say he repents what he then did. Tho' this Discourse looks as if it were design'd to appease the Criminals Ghost, or at least the Resentments of his living Friends, sounding out with perpetual Noise and Clamour, the Rigor of the never to be forgotten Sentence.

But tho' I am far from looking upon the *Glorious Memory* to be like these, a wicked Health; yet should I not look upon it more justifiable, if (as is suggested, with equal Reason and Charity) it had the least tendency to lessen that great Veneration and Esteem we ought to have, for our truly Pious and Glorious QUEEN. But if on the contrary it directly tends to promote both, as I am perswaded it does, then will all Men ask, Where is the Loyalty of those who write against it, and condemn it? For was it not K. W — in clear'd Her way to the Throne, and left Her in the quiet Possession of it? To drink then to his Memory is in Effect to celebrate Her Coronation, and recognize Her

Of the Title

Title, in opposition to *Papists* and *Jacobites*, who alone dispute it ; and therefore not daring to fly directly in Her Face, went all their Disaffection and Malice on him that's Dead ; which they may do they think with most Safety and Impunity, knowing at the same Time, that the more they can prevail on Men to suspect his Title, it will in Consequence affect Hers. And therefore to assert his Right, and preserve his Memory from Reproach and Obloquy, directly tends to promote that Veneration *every one ought to have for the best of QUEENS*, and establish Her Government.

I shall not presume with his L — d — p to scan the Councils of Providence so nicely, as to say the Wisdom of God, could not have set the Queen on the Throne, and establish'd her Title by other *Methods as advantageous* ; but this I dare say, with submission to his L — d — p's more profound Penetration, that what God does, not what vain Man imagines, is always best ; and cannot for my part say, how we should have come at Q. Anne, had it not been for K. W — m, more than how we can now get out of the Fogs and Darkness of Winter into the Warmth and Serenity of the Summer Solstice, otherwise than thro' the struggle between Heat and Cold in the Spring. But because we remember how seasonable and welcome this was, will any one say this tends to lessen our Veneration for the Summer's Sun ? Envy may suggest it, but one who makes use of his Senses, will never believe it.

This I own is a Digression not usual in *Casuistical* and *Polemick* Discourses, but I'm led into it by a venerable Precedent, where such Incidents are the chief Arguments, and without which it would be Insipid, it would be Loathsome to all. To return therefore to the *Question* ; if then the precise Action of *Drinking to the Memory of a Dead Person*, be not in it self sinful, but in its Nature indifferent ; then the Question, as here express'd, is not only *Profane*, as has been observ'd, but likewise *Illogical* and *Insidious*. For, as it cannot uni-
versally

versally be Affirm'd, no more can it universally be Deny'd; One cannot say absolutely that it is Sinful, no more can it be said in all Cases and Instances to be Lawful; One can't say it is lawful to *Drink to the Memory of the Dead*, if by the Dead is meant all or every one that is dead, taken Collectively or Distributively; but as of some, that is, of Good or Well-deserving Persons: For it is not justifiable to speak in the Praise of Ill Persons, as such; because this is to give Vice what is only due to Vertue.

To avoid all Caption then, the Question ought to be put, Whether to drink to *the Memory of any that are dead*, be *sinful* to us Christians, or under the Gospel-Dispensation? And then the latter Question would be impertinent, as being included in the general; for if it be sinful to *Drink to the Memory of any Deceased Person*, then of course, of a Departed Monarch, whether he means Queen Elizabeth, or King Charles the First, or King William of Blessed Memory.

This then being the True State of the Question, I freely grant his Lordship, *That it is not, whether we may have an honourable Opinion of Great and Worthby Persons; for this we can't often help: Nor whether we are to be not affected to the Revolution.* For this many say, who perhaps would be thought to think otherwise. *Nor whether we ought to Honour the Memory of King William, by defacing his Statue, and refusing this Health? Nor whether Drinking is a Sacrament?* Because it is prophane to imagine it. *Nor whether we may remember an Absent Friend, whether He or She; nor a great many Things more, which have as much Relation to the Question.*

I shall therefore add but one Thing more for the Benefit of those poor unfortunate Christians, who have never been at the Colleges, nor instructed in the Forms, wherein Fresh-men's Questions are usually fix'd on the Hall-Door with a Neg — or an Aff — tail'd to them. Be it known therefore unto all such, that

that the Affirmative affix'd to this Question, as propos'd by his Lordship, signifies, that his Lordship holds the Affirmative of it; and is ready to maintain, *Opponentibus quibuscumque*, as a Professor in Theology; i. e. against all Mankind, whether Jews, Turks, Infidels, or Hereticks, or even against all good Orthodox Christians; That to Drink to the Memory of any Dead Person, is in it self sinful; or rather (as I wou'd have it put) is a Sin now under the Gospel: A Sin, he pronounces it, of an enormous and gygantic Size, P. 3. *An impious Prophanation of that very Action, which is consecrated to the Memory of Christ alone: An horrid Abuse of the Eucharist, a Desecration of it; of a Guilt of a much deeper Dye, (because to the Memory of the Dead) and of a more abominable Nature than Profanation and Sacrilege.*

And with all so glaringly true, (tho' he be the First that ever discover'd it to be so) that to unprejudic'd Persons it requires no Proof; and that if he had flourish'd in good Times, or in any other Age, than the Present, the very proposing it would have startled all good Christians, (who hitherto never scrupled doing it on Occasion:) They wou'd immediately say, (not have said) That his Lordship was going about to demonstrate a self-evident Truth, which no Body doubted. He wou'd have met with no other Return, But who denies it? And that it will certainly come about to this again, (i. e. the next Plantonick Revolution) whenever Truth and Loyalty shall Triumph over Infidelity and Faction; which, it seems, his L—d—p at present thinks they do not, nor ever will, till he have the sole Power to Reform the World; for can it be in better Hands than it now is, except his L—d—p's.

II. Let us now consider by what Arguments he proves this momentous Article, and demonstrates us all abominable Sinners. Certainly they are no less than Self-evident, since the Affirmative of the Question is so; nor can any thing less justify these terrible Denunciations, and severe Censures, from the Mouth of a Christian

stian Bishop. Certainly, he does not condemn us all as guilty of Profaneness, and Idolatry, and Disloyalty, without sufficient Ground.

But is not his Authority enough? To expect more, can proceed from nothing more than want of a pious Zeal for Religion, and a Spirit of Faction and Infidelity, peculiar to this Age? However, he is pleas'd to condescend to our Weakness and Prejudice, &c. He proves irrefragably this infallible *self-evident Truth*. How? Not by any express Command, not by a more *self-evident Principle*; for all the *Logick in the World* can't furnish him with either; but by a Medium equally *self-evident*; by an Inference from a Text understood as no Man ever understood it before; and which, I dare say, will never be understood so again. By an *Implication provisionally reserved* to be discover'd by his Lordship, to the utter Confusion of all those, who ever since the Preaching of the Gospel, have drank to the Memory of any Dead Person. And yet a Passage, than which few or none in the whole Bible has been more frequently treated of, or more solemnly explain'd, either from the Pulpit or the Press; it is, 1 Cor. II. 25, 26. *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood: This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in Remembrance of me: For as oft as ye Eat this Bread, and Drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death till he come.*

From this Passage it is he brings all his Proof, as the Reader may judge, that it is an *abominable Sin* now under the Gospel to drink to the Memory of any dead Person; by Inferences and Criticisms, unconfined to the ordinary Forms of Reasoning, and inconsistent with common Sense, the ordinary Construction of Words, and the plain Context. And therefore, to lead the incautious Reader from the State of the Question, and artfully amuse him with mysterious Absurdities, floating in his Imagination, fertile of such Speculations, in order as one would think, to clear his Way to the Point, and form his Argument in *Barbara*, he very methodically premises

premises these several Things, which I must beg the Reader's Patience to Trace him in Step by Step, to give him the clearer Idea of the Argument and the Argumentator.

From this Passage, says he, these several Things are very plain.

First, *That Drinking to the Memory of a Person dead, is the most profound Mystery of the Gospel, and Foundation of our whole Christianity.* Which if Toland had affirm'd, he had been very justly accused, and condemn'd for Blasphemy, had not only his Book burnt, but his Tongue too, according to our good Laws. For is Christ then dead, the individual Person here meant, or that can be meant? Then in Truth, *all the Dispensations of God from the Beginning of the World, which were to center in that Death of Christ which we vainly drink to, are not completed, but defeated; as St. Paul Reasons with the Corinthians in the 1st Epist. ch. 15. 14, 17. -- If Christ be not risen, then our Preaching is vain, and your Faith also is vain, we are found False Witnesses: And ye are yet in your Sins.*

Again, allowing Christ alone to be here meant by the general Character of a Person dead; is the single Act of Drinking to his Memory in the Eucharist, the most profound Mystery of the Gospel, and Foundation of our whole Christianity? I would not then have other honest Christians Religion judged of by his: For St. Paul expressly affirms, that the great Mystery of Godliness, or the Christian Religion, is God manifested in the Flesh, &c. 1 Tim. 2. 16.

As for Drinking to His Blessed Memory in the Sacrament, 'tis but a Part of that Holy Rite of his own Institution. And whatever Mystery there may be in it, I shall not now consider, leaving it to the Mystical Divines. But this I dare say, it is not the Foundation of our whole Christianity; but Jesus Christ, and him Crucify'd, and Risen from the Dead; He is the chief Corner Stone, upon which the Divine Fabrick of God's Church does stand as upon a Rock, against which the

Gates of Hell shall not prevail, in whom Men must believe before they come to *Drink in his Memory*, &c. And tho' his Blood be signify'd by the Wine drank ; yet so to Drink is our Duty, not the Foundation of our Religion, which it presupposes.

Secondly, *That Drinking to the Memory of a Person dead is an Action made Sacramental*. If he means to any Person dead, according to the plain ordinary Acceptation of the Words, the Assertion is not only false but impious ; But if with a mental Reservation to our Lord Christ, had he no Design to lead honest well-meaning People into Superstition, he ought to have expressed himself so in plain Terms : 'Tis allow'd then, that Drinking, according to Christ's Institution, in the Eucharist, and no otherwise, *is a Sacramental Action*, as it is also to Take, Bless, Break, and Eat Bread, and Take the Cup, &c. but at no other Time, on no other Occasion, more the one than the other ; for no Action can be Sacramental but as us'd in a Sacrament. And this I would caution the Reader to carry always in his Thoughts, and which himself seems to allow elsewhere.

Thirdly, *That the very Essence of the Eucharistical Sacrifice consists in that Action of Eating and Drinking to the Memory of a Person once Dead*. Here the Reader may observe, he changes the indefinite Idea of *a Person dead*, into another of *a Person once dead* ; which are very different, and yet the Latter no less exceptionable and indefinite than the former. For was not *Lazarus*, the Widow's Son of *Sarepta*, and others recorded in Scripture, *once dead and alive again* ? Suppose then, that one should have Drunk to their Memory when alive the Second Time, would the *Essence of the Eucharistical Sacrifice have consisted in that Action* ? But if by *a Person dead*, and *a Person once dead*, he still means one and the same, Our Lord Christ, why does he affect indefinite ambiguous Terms, rather than to speak plainly ? Is this according to the Candor and Ingenuity of the Christian Doctrine ?

But

But here is another material Alteration, or Shifting of the Terms. For whereas he hitherto made mention only of *Drinking to the Memory of a Person dead*; he now speaks of *the Action of Eating and Drinking to the Memory of that Person*; as if Eating and Drinking made up but One and the same Action; like the *Papists*, who make Eating, Drinking; He makes Drinking, Eating. And concludes of bare Drinking to the *Memory of a Person dead*, what he affirms of both *Eating and Drinking in the Sacrament*. For, says he, in the following Sentence, *'Tis in Drinking to the Memory of Christ's Death, in which the very Life and Being of that Sacrament consists: 'Tis the very Ground and Reason of the Institution; that which makes it mysterious and obligatory*. This he affirms of bare Drinking, *without Eating*; tho' this is as Essential to the Sacrament, and as positively enjoy'd as the other. But whatever it is makes *this Drinking mysterious*, I leave it to his Lordship to explain; as also, how Drinking to the Memory of Christ makes *it self obligatory*. For I, with other plain Christians, have always thought that it was the positive Institution and Command of Christ made it obligatory on all Christians, &c.

But the grand Mystery is, *how the Essence of the Eucharistical Sacrifice consists in that Action*. For is Eating and Drinking, or Drinking alone, *Sacrificing*? I have heard of People Eating of Sacrifices, and of others Sacrificing to their Bellies, in Eating and Drinking: But how this, tho' perform'd to the Memory of a Person once dead, of Christ, make up the *Essence* of the *Eucharistical*, or any other Sacrifice, I am yet to learn from his Lordship; and if not from him, I despair of learning it from any other Person, Living or Dead.

I always thought, that Sacrifices were somewhat given or offer'd to God; and therefore that their *Essence*, as such, must consist in some sort of Giving, not Receiving; *i. e.* Eating and Drinking.

Secondly, His Lordship, I have Hopes, has not forgot, that according to the *Metaphysicians*, who some take to be near of Kin to the *Mystical Divines*; neither the Efficient nor Final Cause can, *ingredi Essentiam Rei*, or be reckon'd of the *Essence* of a Thing; tho' they give *Life and Being* to it. Because then the same Thing wou'd be the Cause of it self, and be before it self; wou'd, and wou'd not be, at the same Time. But the Memory of Christ, or the Celebration of it, is the End of Eating and Drinking in the Sacrament, whether consider'd as a Sacrifice, or in the formal Notion of a Sacrament; and therefore cannot constitute its *Essence*.

Again, If the *Essence of the Eucharist*, consider'd under the Notion of a Sacrifice, consists in Eating and Drinking to the Memory of a Person once dead; then the Memory of the Person so dead, must be in the Action, (for the *Essence* cannot be separated from the Action, whose *Essence* it is,) 'tis the Action must think, and call Christ to Remembrance, not the Agent.

Once more, If the *Essence of the Sacrament*, or Holy *Eucharist*, consisted meerly in Eating and Drinking to the Memory of Christ; then no one cou'd receive the Sacrament unworthily; no one cou'd receive the Sacrament, but who at the same Time, when he received, had a lively Sense and Memory of Christ's Death; which is directly opposite to St. Paul's Doctrine, in the Verse following the Text, as in the whole Chapter, where he reproves the *Corinthians* for prophaning the Sacrament, and not duly considering the Design and Institution of it, *not discerning the Lord's Body*, nor distinguishing that from an ordinary Supper; as the Bishop does not discern the Difference between Drinking of the Holy Cup, from ordinary, or common Drinking.

In a Word, his Lordship knows this Sacrament, or if he call'd it *Sacrifice*, is a Moral, (or if he like the Term better) a *mystical Entity*, not a meer physical or
meta-

metaphysical One. And if it be so, ought he not to find out somewhat in this Moral Entity, Analogous to the Form or Essence of a Physical One? Which I at present leave to his *abstracted* Speculations.

His Lordship, who knows a *self-evident Truth* at first Sight, will grant, That a Part is not the Whole, nor Equal to the Whole; nor of course can constitute the *Essence* of the Whole. He knows likewise, that it is the whole Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, consider'd as One continued Action, or Feast, is instituted, and to be celebrated in Remembrance of Christ. And therefore, that the bare *Action of Drinking*, more than of *Eating*, being but a Part or particular Action of that Sacrament, cannot constitute the Whole. For tho' both Actions are expressly enjoin'd and prescrib'd, with a *Do this in Remembrance of ME*; yet not as Two Sacraments, but as Two Parts. Neither of which can, by any Means, or upon any Pretence be omitted, without deviating from its first Institution; and Maiming, or in Effect evacuating the Whole.

These Things consider'd, I heartily joyn with him in his Caution, That *whosoever hopes to be sav'd by Receiving the Sacrament* (provided he does not mean the bare *Opus Operatum*) *let him take Care how he does the same to any Person whatsoever*, (which I must own, I never heard any One so impious as to have done, unless the Practice of the Church of Rome look that Way, who celebrate the Holy Sacrament, and as 'tis said, Sacrifice Christ to every Saint in the Kalendar, on their respective Holy-days.) But then I am quite astonish'd, he shou'd call *Drinking to the Memory of the Dead*, the same Action as the Sacrament; or rather the Sacrament it self. Tho' it be not done in that Manner, or with the same Design, or with the same Circumstances; because, says he, that remains in the Health; in which the very Being and Essence of the Holy Sacrament or Eucharist consists. For then the Essence of the Eucharist, i.e. the Eucharist it self must be in every such Health, suppose to the

prom

pious Memory of Balf. For if it have the same Essence, it must be the same Action. For two Actions cannot have one Essence; and yet, this same Action must also differ from it self. For it is allow'd, not to be done in the same Manner, or with the same Design, or with the same Circumstance; i. e. truly it is not the same Action. Such impious Absurdities will Men venture upon to serve an Hypothesis, or rather a Whim! But that which is yet more strange, is, That such Blasphemies shou'd meet with Approbation in a National Synod; to the utter Confusion of those, who wonder that the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* shou'd have the Sanction of General Councils. For my Part, I think the Bishop's the more absurd, if any Degrees may be allow'd in Absurdities. For he maintains a Contradiction in express Terms: i. e. That an Action *is*, and is not the same. Whereas the other implies only an Impossibility, or Contradiction in Consequence; as that One Body shou'd be in Two, or more Places; or that the same Substance shou'd support different external Forms at the same Time.

And yet as palpable a Contradiction as my Lord's is, 'tis the chief Hinge whereon the Dispute turns, and the Substance of the several Solutions he gives to the Objections he frames against himself. It is, says he, the same Action Consecrated to the Memory of Christ. And therefore let me mind the Reader once for all; and furnish him with a plain Reply out of his own Concessions; that it is not the same Action, and that it is blasphemous and absurd to say it is. As thus, when he says, P. 10. That it can be no Doubt with a sober Christian, whether an Action, so Holy as the Sacrament is, dedicated to the Memory of our Blessed Saviour, consecrated to such Divine Purposes, and made the very Test of our Christian Profession, may be applied to common Use, and made an Expression of civil, or religious Respect and Complement to the Person or Character of whomsoever we think fit to apply it to? Answer. No, it can be no Doubt. But then Drinking in

in civil Conversation, to the Memory of any, whether dead or alive, is not that Holy Action; is not Celebrating the Lord's Supper: For this can be done in Memory of none but Christ. And if the same Form or Words are us'd (as I never heard they were) tho' it would be prophane with a Witness, yet wou'd not be the same moral Action.

Again, That if it should be ask'd any sincere Christian, Whether, what Christ has commanded to be done Sacramentally, and Religiously, in Remembrance of him, may without Sin be done to any other Person whatsoever, in Remembrance of them; or rather of any such Person; that is, Whether the Sacrament should be celebrated to their Memory? He ought to answer, No surely. But he may also say, That to drink to the Memory of his old Friend, or Benefactor, is no such Holy, Religious, or Sacramental Action. Which is sufficiently prov'd, without being Master of all the Logick in the World; or even of that which is in *Burgersdicius*, or *Herebord*, or *Provost's Logick*: tho' there be more there, than many who have often read 'em, and gain'd no small Profit by 'em, understand, or make good Use of.

Having promis'd these several Things, (as one wou'd think) to clear his Way to the main Argument, (to what Effect the Reader may judge,) he sets to the Business in good earnest; To fit (says he) the Argument (which he has hitherto very artfully conceal'd) for the Genius of the Disputers of this World, I will reduce the whole Contest (wonderful indeed) to a Point, in one or two Syllogisms. Yet, how can he in Conscience do this, who knows we are forbidden, to conform our selves to the World, or to seek to please Men? Yea, and Nay, he knows that Syllogizing is the Language of the Beast; an Heathenish Art of deceiving harmless Men, trick'd up, and brought into Fashion by Heathen *Aristotle*; and much cultivated and abused, to disguise erroneous Doctrines by the Creatures of the False Prophet. If he therefore makes use of this, falsely so call'd, Science,

D

may

may not one suspect he does it to carry on the *like Design*, to set off Falshood for Truth. How much more becoming his Character and Subject had it been, to fit his Argument to the Genius of the Disputers of the other World, and talk of Mysteries in the Stile, and with the Tongue of Angels? *Away with these Subtilties in the most important Action of our Life, and upon which our Salvation so much depends.* How much more becoming him to imitate St. Paul, to use the greatest Plainness and Simplicity, and avoid the enticing Words of Man's Wisdom — 1 Cor. 2. 4.

But the Ladies and Courtiers must be gratified, who best understand the Language of *this World*; or are apt to admire most what they do not understand; and to think those Men understand most, who speak not to be understood. They, no doubt, are expert in all the Modes and Figures of Syllogism; and are perfectly acquainted with the various Sorts of 'em, Simple and Compound, Perfect and Imperfect, Catagoricals and Hypotheticals, Enthymems, Sorites, &c. and run 'em through *Barbara, Celarent, Darii, &c.* like Knots on their Fingers Ends. They likewise presently take all Sophisms in Pieces, and shew you a Paralogism at Sight, as Bankers do bad Money. That's an *Equivoke non Cause pro Causa, a dicto secundum quid, ad Dictum simpliciter, &c.* But of all others they most readily discern the *Sophismata Philantia, Utilitatis, &c.* They ken a Man at first Sight, whether he publishes a Discourse out of Vain-Glory, or to get a Promotion: Whether he means to write himself out of Preferment into Credit, or out of Credit into Preferment, &c.

For their Benefit and Edification therefore, let us to the One or Two tremendous Syllogisms, wherein the whole Contest is reduced to a Point, and make short Work on't.

If Christ has appropriated that Action of Drinking to the Memory of the Dead, to his own Person, it is highly sinful to apply it to any other. So far as he has appropriated to him-

himself. I suppose his Lordship means ; or he paralogizes egregiously ; and in this Sense we will not dispute this Proposition.

But, *Christ has appropriated Drinking to the Memory of the Dead, (i. e. All Drinking to the Memory of the Dead) to his own Person, Ergo.* As for the minor Proposition, he proves it thus ; *If Christ has instituted that Action, viz. Drinking to the Memory of the Dead, in Honour of himself ; he has appropriated, restrain'd, limited, and engross'd it all to his own Person ; and made it utterly unlawful, sacrilegious, and idolatrous, to Drink to the Memory of any dead Person, except himself.*

But Christ has instituted it in Honour of himself, Ergo.

Now neither of these Propositions is worth a Rapp. He is pleas'd indeed to say, *none but the Quakers deny the Minor ; but that is only a Flourish to divert the Reader from it, as most faulty.* And if any one denies the Consequence of the Major, let him shew what other Way there is of appropriating an Action to Christ, besides express Institution and Consecration of it into a Sacrament. And that may soon be done, when there is Occasion for it, namely by express Precept.

But to the Syllogisms, the Ladies know very well they are Hypothetical, and are brought to the Test by reducing them to Catagoricals, which, for their Ease and Assistance I will do by the Latter thus. *Whatever Action Christ has Instituted in Honour of Himself, he has appropriated, restrain'd, and limited to his own Person, (that Action but no other.)*

But Christ has instituted Drinking to the Memory of the Dead, or any or all of the Dead, in Honour of Himself. Ergo, He has appropriated all such Drinking to his own Person. Subtle indeed ! Suppose then, that One who is no Quaker, should be so ill-natur'd, as to disappoint his Lordship ; and out of meer Crossness, granting him the Major, shou'd, contrary to his Hopes, positively deny the Minor ? What Proof does he leave us of it ? Or must we expect it with Patience in a Second

Discourse? viz. That Christ has instituted all Drinking to the Memory of the Dead to himself; for this is his Meaning; thus he ought to have express'd himself. Because, as the Ladies (for whose Benefit this Discourse was writ) do very well know, this Syllogism is in the first Mode of the first Figure, i. e. in *Barbara*, of all others the most perfect: But the minor *Terminus*, or the Subject of the minor Proposition ought to be taken universally; otherwise his Lordship makes a Paralogism, which is very foul Play, and may very justly be taken very ill at Court, as a dishonourable Attempt upon their Understandings. But to the Point.

The Proposition, upon which all the Strefs lies is this *Minor*; if it be false, then all is lost, and the whole Discourse ridiculous and absurd; and all the Money laid out on it at this good Season, and which would have been no inconsiderable Relief to the Poor, thrown away; Nay, the *Minor* be forc'd to go a Begging, and no one found to take the Guardianship of it out of *Charity*; no, not any *Jacobite*, or *Kilday'd Protestant*, because they have Friends dead, to whose Memory they upon occasion very religiously drink. Let us therefore examine more closely the Truth of it.

Christ has instituted it, i. e. Drinking, all Drinking to the Memory of the Dead in Honour of Himself. Where we are to take notice 1st of the general, or universal Idea of Drinking to the Memory of the Dead. 2^{dly}, Of the original Institution of it by Christ. 3^{dly}, The End to which it is instituted, his Honour.

I shall not at present enquire into the Origine, or first Rise of Drinking to the Memory of the Dead; 'tis allow'd to be as old as Christ at least, because instituted by him; or if in use before, appropriated by him to his own Honour. But must note,

1st, That the positive Idea of Drinking to the Memory of the Dead, implies much more than Drinking to the Memory of Christ; for it is universal, and comprehends

pretends all such Drinking ; or else the Syllogism is not worth a Rush, as I observed.

2^{dly}, That all this Drinking must be so far from being unlawful, that it is pious and commendable, since it is all instituted to Christ's Honour, and therefore Drinking to the Memory of a dead Monarch ; for this, as well as all other *Drinking to the Memory of the Dead* is instituted to Christ's Honour, and included in the general Proposition, therefore must be pious and commendable. I here appeal to all skill'd in the Doctrine of Syllogisms, and Method of Reasoning, whether these Observations and Inferences are not just, supposing his Syllogisms to be good ; but if they be not good, nor the Terms justly conceived, then he plays the Sophister, either ignorantly or with Design. Which then shall we suspect ? The *Proposist's* Logick, or Sincerity ?

And now, to bring all to the Capacity of the most ordinary Reader, and make him judge in this Controversy, let me desire him to look back to the Passage from whence he here pretends to Reason.

There we 1st find our Lord instituted the Cup as an outward Sign of his Blood, whereby the New Covenant is sealed and ratified, as he had, in the foregoing Verse, instituted the Bread, and in the same manner, a Sign of his Body, &c.

2^{dly}, We find also, that as our Lord had in the foregoing Verses, commanded the Bread, &c. to be taken in the Sacrament, so he here commands the Cup, *Do this in Remembrance of me.*

3^{dly}, I further desire the Reader to take notice, here is express mention made of Drinking in Remembrance of Christ, and of none other Person whatsoever, whether *dead or living.*

4^{thly}, That Christ spoke the Words, and therefore was not *dead*, when he thus commanded us to Drink in Remembrance of *him*, nor is now *dead* ; nor, that ever the Sacrament was celebrated when he was *dead*. And therefore

therefore, that Drinking to the Memory of Christ in the Sacrament, is by no means Drinking in Memory of a Person dead, or as dead: And of Course can have no Reference to, nor Semblance of the Action of *Drinking to the Memory of any Person dead*. But, that these Two Actions are as different, as any Two Actions whatsoever; as Drinking for a Man's own Health, and Drinking for another's Pleasure.

Fifthly, Once more, that here 'tis not expressly said, That we shou'd thus drink in Remembrance of Christ, merely to do *him Honour*; for tho' it may tend to his Honour, as all Acts of Obedience to his Commands do; *If ye love me, keep my Commandments*; yet does not this Act more directly tend to his Honour, than our Advantage. Poor Mortals have their own Name and Memory in view! but our bare Remembring Christ, alas! can add nothing to his Glory! but it is of infinite Benefit for us to do it. It enlivens our Faith in him, confirms, and is a certain Pledge to *us of his Love, the Forgiveness of our Sins, and all the Benefits of his Passion*; for which Reason, we ought frequently to do it. But which, as other necessary Duties, we are by Nature too too apt to forget and neglect, unless obliged by certain external Acts, to express and signify, and call 'em to mind. 'Tis our Duty to worship God frequently, and publicly; but how remiss and negligent shou'd we be in doing it, did not God positively require us to do it, at least one Day in the Week.

Now these Things consider'd, will any Man say, the Words appropriate the general Idea of *Drinking to the Memory of a Person dead*; to Christ alone? Or that he has instituted every such Action to his Honour? 'Tis true, indeed, he has appropriated to *himself*, i. e. to his Memory, the Action of Drinking, as also of Eating, &c. in the Sacrament, but not the precise Action of *Drinking to the Memory of a Person dead, or as dead, in or out of the Sacrament*. For if we drank to the Memory of any Person dead, in the Sacrament, it wou'd

not

not be to Christ's Memory, but of the Person dead, which wou'd be a great *Desecration of that Holy Rite*. And if out of the Sacrament, or in civil Conversation, one drinks to the Memory of a deceas'd Friend, what Relation has that to the Sacrament, more than if he drank to the Memory of an absent Friend, or the Health of his Prince? For what is the Intent or Meaning of such a Health, but to preserve in our Minds a grateful Sense of Her Virtues, and the Benefits We enjoy by Her Government, tho' Absent and at a Distance from us?

Well! but says my Good Lord, Christ in Commanding us to drink in Remembrance of *him*, does implicitly at least forbid us to drink in Remembrance of *any other Person*. But if this be his Meaning, then he should have made it the Conclusion of one of his *Syllogisms*. As thus;

If Christ has here commanded us, to drink only in Remembrance of Himself; it is sinful to drink in Remembrance of any other Person whatsoever.

But Christ has here commanded us to drink only in Remembrance of Himself; Ergo.

And this would be granted, so far as Christ has commanded us to Drink in Memory of Himself, *i. e.* in the *Holy Sacrament*. For so far it is sinful to Drink in Memory of *any other Person, either Dead or Living*. Which is farther than he carries it. But then, if he wou'd infer from Christ's Commanding us to Drink in the Sacrament in Memory of Himself; that it is sinful to Drink out of the Sacrament, or in civil Conversation, in Memory of any other Person, it concludes as strongly of the Living, as of the Dead; and that's more than he is willing to infer. For I take Leave to observe to his Lordship, That when a Health is drank to a Person Dead, or Living; it is not drank
to

to 'em meerly as Dead, or Living; but as worthy of our Respect, or Esteem, upon the account of their great Actions, or Qualities; however different in some Circumstances, may be the Forms, wherein we express, or signify it. For Drinking an Health is only a Form wherein we express such Esteem. Whence it is that we refuse an Health, when we don't think the Person is worthy our Esteem, or good Wishes, or Remembrance. Therefore, as we may commendably have an Esteem or Value for the great Actions and noble Qualities of a Person dead, as living; so may we express the same by Actions or Forms customary and significant of such Esteem or Value. Wherefore we may safely conclude, That if our Lord design'd to inhabit any customary Form of expressing our Esteem for the Dead, more than for the Living; he wou'd have done it in express Terms. For *where there is no Law, there is no Transgression.* But, says my Lord; *Here is no Occasion for an express Command for that which the common Reason of Mankind most naturally suggests.* True indeed, in Matters of plain Morality; but what has the common Reason of Mankind to do in Matters of positive Institution? Unless my Lord would have his own Conceits pass for the common Reason of Mankind? For who, besides his L—d—p, would make general Conclusions from particular Facts? Christ has commanded us to *Drink in Remembrance of him, in the Sacrament.* Therefore, says the common Reason of Mankind, *'tis sinful to Drink to the Memory of any Person dead, on any Occasion.* The good People in *Japan, Mexico,* and all about, and between the Two Poles, would make this Inference as naturally, as that two and three make five. My Lord taught Logick for some considerable Time, and presided in a College where it has been read to as good Effect, as any University in *Europe.* But the Masters of Sciences are not ty'd up to strict Rules.

But

But, says my L—d, *nor are we without a positive Precept, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.* True indeed, this is a Paraphrase of the First Commandment; and Drinking in Remembrance of Christ in the Sacrament is a very solemn Act of Divine Worship; and therefore not to be perform'd to any Man, dead or living, without the *heinous Guilt of Idolatry*. Yet does it not from hence follow, that it is a Breach of the first Command, to drink in civil Conversation to the Memory of a deceas'd Person, more than to pay civil Honour or Worship to the Prince or Magistrate; more than to call them Master or Sovereign, or bow the Knee to his L—d—p, tho' without Divinity. Nay, this last is a special Act appropriated to the Name of *Jesus*; no less than drinking in Remembrance of him in the holy Eucharist. Was it not then a more than civil Respect paid the *Broom-stick* by the Virgin Ladies, (which the most Christian Author of a *Tale of a Tub*, quite omitted in his sublime Essay on that Machine,) who having trick'd it up in Pontifical Robes, and all the Gravity of a Cardinal, practis'd before it, as if it were his Lordship without a Metaphor. Or what does my Lord think of rehearsing *Te Deum*, or any *solemn Anthem*, not for Devotion, but to be the more ready at it the next State-Day? But *may not one commit Idolatry, and give Divine Worship, without designing it?* No, I reply, with all possible Deference to his Lordship, but by such Acts, as suppose Divinity, or Divine Attributes in the Objects, be they perform'd by *Papists* or *Pagans*. For to pray to Saints, or before Idols or Images, does suppose the Vorary believes they can hear, and help him, *i. e.* that they partake of the Incommunicable Attributes of the *Divinity*, *Omnipresence*, and *Omnipotence*; otherwise it would be no less absurd, than for one to kneel down very reverently every Morning, and pray devoutly to the

Sophi of Persia, or the Emperor of China, who never heard there was such a Man in Being.

Thus far his Syllogisms conclude, wherein he proposes to *bring the whole Contest to a Point, viz. That Christ has instituted Drinking, in the Sacrament, to his Honour; and so far has appropriated to himself Drinking to the Memory of the Dead. To himself!* which in Truth is not *Drinking to the Memory of the Dead at all*: God forbid it should; nor *Drinking to the Memory of any once dead, (as such)* but only *Drinking religiously to the Memory of Christ*. I know, he would from hence infer, that Christ, by commanding us thus to Drink to his Memory, has implicitly at least forbidden us to Drink, in civil Conversation, to the Memory of any *Dead Person*; but he may as well infer, that he has likewise forbid us to Eat, or Drink at all, except in the Sacrament religiously; or to use any other Act or Circumstance of Action us'd in the Sacrament, or to Drink to the Health or Memory of any one living.

One would expect now, that the Contest brought to the Point, were at an End. But he has found out another Argument, (which he has not thought fit to throw into a Syllogism,) in the very Form of the Institution, *viz. That this Limitation of all Drinking to the Memory of the Dead, or in their Remembrance, to the Person of Christ, is made in express Words, very plain to that Effect in the Original; (tho' never discover'd by any Critick, or Casuist before,) τὸ το ποιεῖν, ὡς ἂν μνησθῆτε ἐμὲ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναμνησιν.* The literal and easy Translation of which is this, *As often as ye shall drink this, do it in Remembrance of me; i. e. as often as ye drink in Remembrance of the Dead, do it be sure to no other dead Friend, Prince or Monarch, but to ME; wick must be own'd to be a new and elegant Exposition of his own; and for which he is oblig'd to no Critick, or Commentator in the World, or that ever was. What an Happiness it is to have a fertil Genius, and be able to interpret Languages one*
does

does not understand? But pray by what Authority does my good Lord render, τὸ ποιεῖτε, ὁσῶς ἂν πινετε, as often as ye shall drink thus? Does τὸ ποιεῖτε signify *do, or drink this*? But allow it did; yet how does it appear that the Apostles did then drink in Remembrance of a Person Dead, or once Dead? They were to drink to the Memory of none but Christ. But Christ was not dead, when he instituted this Sacrament, nor at any other Time, that they, or any Christians, ever since celebrated this Sacrament. For his Lordship's Wit and Learning will fail him, whenever he goes about to prove the Disciples celebrated this Supper, during our Lord's Continuance in the State of the Dead, or in the Grave.

But says he, The Import is the same in the Translation of our English Bible, (there be several Translations,) *This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in Remembrance of Me.* But how this imports, *as oft as ye shall drink thus, do it in Remembrance of Me*, none but his Lordship can conceive. The Original is, *Do this, as oft as ye drink in Remembrance of Me; or as oft as ye drink or think fit to keep this Feast, &c. in Remembrance of Me.* Do ye this, which you see me do, take the Cup, &c. The English Translators supply it, meaning the Cup; i. e. as oft as ye drink this Cup in Remembrance of Me, do this. But is this the Import of my Lord's Translation, *as oft as ye shall drink thus*, i. e. in Remembrance of One dead, do it in Remembrance of Me, i. e. not in Remembrance of the Dead, or of any dead Person whatsoever? Is there then no Difference between these two Translations? But that the Drift and Design of that ὁσῶς ἂν πινετε, is not set in so plain Light in the Former as in the Latter. Which, in Truth, is rather setting it in Darkness and Error.

The Use, adds he, which is generally made of that Clause, (as by Archbishop Tillotson, and Others of ordinary Genius) is from thence (considering the Nature of the Rite) to urge the Frequency of Receiving the Sacrament; which, tho' a good Inference; yet, it is not so direct as that, for which the Clause was chiefly intended, (or rather which

was not intended at all) namely, to *restrain this Action of Drinking to the Memory of a Dead Person, to that of our Saviour, (who is not dead) and to prevent its being done to any one else.* And to confirm this, the Word *οὕτως* is repeated in the next Verse, (rather indeed to refute it) and the reason of this Restriction assign'd, (not at all) For, as often as ye do this. But where my good Lord is do this in the next Verse ? The Words are plainly, for as often as ye eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup, ye do shew forth the Lord's Death till he come. Wherefore to say, as oft as ye do thus, i. e. drink to the Memory of a dead Person, instead of as often as ye eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup, is such an Instance of Candour and Reverence for the Word of God, as I challenge his Lordship's Friends to produce in any other Christian Bishop ; 'tis like sliding over the Second Commandment as the *Papists* do, and for much the same Reason. For as this is apt to shock the Minds of those who are taught to worship Images, should they be suffer'd to read it : So these Words of St. Paul, for as oft as ye eat of that Bread and drink of that Cup, do quite confound his Lordship's Conceit of laying the Stress of the Sacrament on drinking to the Memory of a dead Person ; and his Sense of the foregoing Verse ; for if it be by eating that Bread and drinking that cup we do shew forth the Lord's Death ; then not by drinking only. So that he argues just as the *Papists* act, with this Difference, they drop the Cup, and he drops the Bread.

But the Clause *οὕτως ὡς μνησται*, for the stronger Confirmation of the Affirmative of the Question, his Lordship very judiciously observes, was left out of some Ancient Copies, and particularly the Ethiopick Version, he means some Copies of it, and the Alexandrian Manuscript, because it seem'd incoherent, needless, and to interrupt and perplex the Sense. But how does his Lordship know that ? Or does he think the Translators or Transcribers look'd upon themselves to be proper Judges of that matter, that they might honestly, at their Discretion, alter
or

or leave out Words or Clauses? If his Lordship were allowed this Liberty with a great many of our Refin'd Criticks, I don't question, but the Bible would soon be brought into a narrow Compass. Might not one say as well that it was added in some Ancient Copies by way of Explication, to intimate the Frequency of Celebrating the Holy Rite, as often as they were disposed, and had an opportunity to *Remember Him*. Or rather might not one say, that it was at first dropt in haste by some Transcriber, whose Copy the *Alexandrian* Manuscript was taken from, and which the other Translators also made use of. But be that as it will, why should making it a part of the Original Text be call'd the *Foolishness of God*? For this is a Quality not to be slightly applied to the *Divine Nature*, as signifying the worst sort of Weakness; for St. Paul uses the Expression, *it is not of God but of the Gospel*, which the Scientifick Greeks looked on and derided, as a Doctrine void of Learning or Philosophy.

But for any Copiers or Translators to have had the like Opinion of the Scriptures, or any Clause of 'em, is somewhat odd. And for a Christian Bishop to ascribe it to God, is somewhat more than a witty Allusion, especially if the Clause be not of the original Context. Who reveal'd this to my Lord? *An Action so consecrated to the most holy and divine Purposes, and in Memory of our Lord, would be applied to civil and profane Uses, as it is now* (not more than in Times pass'd; nor as in *Popish* Countries; where the Sacrament is celebrated, and Christ offered a propitiatory Sacrifice, not only for the *Quick* and *Dead*: But also to abate Sicknes in Man or Beasts, and other civil Calamities) *most shamefully at this Day*; but if he means, as I know he does, *in drinking to the Memory of K. William*, I must again say that it is not misapplying the Sacrament, or *Sacramental Drinking*; no Body instead of remembering Christ in the Sacrament remembers *K. William* in his room; and that nothing can be more profane and malicious

licious than to suggest any such thing. But it is very remarkable, that this Clause is left out in the Institution of the Bread; that is, this limiting Clause, and applied only to the Cup, with design in the Purpose and Fore-knowledge of God, to be an invincible Argument to all future Generations, (but to be discover'd by none but my good Lord) for the Truth of the Doctrine I am now defending; which in Truth it is not. And therefore I think his making it a special Design and Purpose of God, is bringing in the Divine Wisdom to patronize a Falshood, *Quædam unquam.* Which is an Expedient in the Judgment of Horace, ought never to be made use of, but in Case of absolute Necessity;

*Nec Deus interfit, nisi dignus vindice nodus,
Inciderit.* —

And which otherwise, I conclude his Lordship, who has that Poet's Measures in so great Veneration, would never have done.

But he proceeds, tho' there are not these restraining Words in the Consecration (these Words are not in the Consecration or Institution strictly speaking, as he supposes 'tis, but in the Precept enjoining the Use of the Sacrament) of the Bread: yet if a Company of Christians should, after Dinner, have a Piece of Bread distributed to every one of them, and each of them in their Turn put it into their Mouth, with this Expression, *Here is to the Glorious Memory of K. William: This would shock, and every one would cry out upon it as horrid and blasphemous in the Implication, p. 15.* No more I dare say, than if the same were done with this Expression, *here is to the Health of Queen Anne:* That which would make it shocking, and horrid or blasphemous, would be the Novelty of it; and the Reference the Terms have to the Sacramental Words. Whereas were it as customary to eat a Moriel of Bread, as it is to drink a Glass of Liquor to the Health of a Person, both would be equally familiar, and not shocking; and the Impiety would be

be the same in both. For tho' it ben't said, *do this, as often as ye eat, in Remembrance of me*, yet is as often as ye eat implied; and it may be observ'd, that none of the Evangelists insert that Clause, even in respect of the Cup. Such another shocking Instance we meet in P. 16. in the Person of the Virgin Mary, the greatest Saint in Heaven, which it is not possible to be known, but by some particular Revelation; (to his Lordship I conceive); suppose, says he, (which indeed ought not to be suppos'd of any other, more than his Lordship) that after Dinner or Supper, on her Day, (which is not in the whole Popish Kalender) a Company of Zealous and Devout Christians, but somewhat Ungodly, should each of 'em take a Cup or Glass of Wine; and in their Turn drink it in these Words, *Here is to the glorious Memory of the Blessed Virgin Mary*. But let me suppose these zealous devout Christians took but each of them a Cup or Glass of Nut-brown Ale, or whipt Syllabub, wou'd this mend the Matter? Or suppose in this Form, *The glorious Health of Qu. A.* Truly, my Lord, as you put the Case 'tis somewhat odd; but when it becomes customary, I don't doubt giving your Lordship a very satisfactory Answer. And till then, it will be no Case of Conference. For my Part, I do not like putting such Cases, as seeming not to carry that Reverence, which every serious Christian ought to have for Holy Things.

But he thinks to make the Case plainer by a Comparison: Let us, says he, take a Parallel in the other Sacrament; and suppose that dipping or sprinkling were made a Form of Admission into any Civil Corporation, (as it was of Proselytes, especially Females amongst the Jews); the very Essence of that Sacrament consists in admitting Persons Members of the Church, which is a Body corporate; I ask then whether this would not be, not only a lessening and an abuse of that Action, but also a most heinous and impious Prophanation of it? I answer, in my Opinion, and of all Men in their Senses, it would not, no more than once amongst the Jews; but why should it? Because, says he,

War

Water is applied in that very Instance, wherein the Essence of that Sacrament (meaning Baptism) consists; which is the Admission of Persons into a Visible Body. Now here is a Sophism Non Causæ, pro Causa. For neither does the Essence of Baptism consist in such Admission, for this is only an Effect of it, but in baptizing Persons with Water, In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, as our Church plainly teaches, (vid. Ministration of private Baptism); nor if it did, would such a civil Use of it be in it self sinful, more than formerly it was a Sin in the Egyptians, Scythians, &c. to circumcise their Children; not Sacramentally, as the Jews; but Traditionally, or upon Natural and Political Accounts. But how is it my Lord's Zeal against an harmless Custom, leads him into our Enemies Quarters, and to fight their Battels, however averse to them in outward Profession? For has he forgot, that this is one of the prime Arguments insisted on by Enthusiasts, against several of our Rites, and Religious Usages; that they are often applied to prophane or civil Use; and in particular, that not only the Action of Drinking, but the whole Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is, by the Test-Act, made a Characteristick of a Party; a State-Engine, to serve mean and unworthy Purposes.

Upon the whole therefore, I think I may modestly say in his Words, No more need be said upon this Subject, for the Conviction of his Lordship, (for I am persuaded he is alone in his Opinion) or of any other, being in a Disposition to be convinced. Such as are self-will'd, and abound in their own Sense, there is no Help for them; they must live and die, full of themselves, and their own Opinion.

The Remainder of this Discourse, bating some Fashionable Scandal, is laid out in removing Objections, which my Lord apprehends, may be made against the Affirmative of the Question, or the Doctrines he here advances. They are allowed to be at least Nine. And being supposed by his Lordship, so many probable Arguments against his single Tentb, are, one would think

think, enough to turn the Scale to the other Side For *Ten* to *One* is great odds. His Lordship has scarce the Tyth on his Side ; and that, I dare say, like one of our Pigs, the poorest of all the Litter. One thing more I dare venture to say, this is the most unlucky *Self-evident Truth* I ever met with, that has so many Objections against it ; all it's Evidence is on the *contrary*. I shall not undertake at present, to vindicate the Force or Pretence of every Objection ; but as to the Solutions given to the most material of them, the Reader, I hope, will find them sufficiently obviated in what is already said. In a word, let one remember, That *Drinking to our Lord's Memory in the Sacrament*, is not the same *ordinary civil Action of drinking to any other, Dead or Living* ; and then there's no Harm done, his hard Words break no Bones.

I shall therefore conclude the whole with a Word or two (with all possible Deference to my Lord's Character,) by way of Inference, from what is here offered against the Sinfulness of *Drinking to the Memory of deceas'd Persons*.

For, if it be no Sin to do so, as has been long customary, (perhaps as long as *Drinking sociably*,) or if his Arguments do not prove it such, what then is like to be the Reward of all his Pains and Zeal, to fill honest Mens Minds with groundless Scruples, and Superstitious Fears ? Or, what is no less blameable, administer Occasion to Prophane Infidel Persons to make merry with Holy Things ? The Approbation and Applause of a *good and faithful Servant*, he has no Reason to expect ; because he has acted beside, or beyond his Commission, which empowers him only to preach the Gospel, and declare the Will of his Lord ; And that to make any thing *Sinful* or *Obligatory* in it's own Nature, which his great Master has not made so ; this indeed is to speak in his own, not in the Name of *Jesus Christ* ; which my Lord knows is plainly forbidden in those Cautions of our Lord to his Apostles

and Disciples, *not to affect to be called Fathers, Masters, or Rabbies*, Mat. 27. 8. Not to dictate or prescribe, as the Rabbies, and Scribes, and Heads of Colleges amongst the *Jews* were wont to do, with a Magisterial Air, and as of their own Infallibility. For One is your Master, namely Christ, and One your Father in Heaven. He alone has Legislative Authority, and can give Laws to Mens Consciences, and say absolutely what *is*, and what *is not Sin*. Hence, it seems, is that Caution of St. James, chap. 3. 1. *My Brethren, be not many Masters, knowing that we shall receive the greater Condemnation*; and more plainly that of St. Peter, 1 Epist. 5. 2. *Not as being Lords over God's Heritage, not to impose and enjoin Duties*, as by an absolute Right, or inherent Power; but as the Servants of God, recommending Virtue as *Examples to the Flock*.

This is the Crime our Lord lays to the Charge of the Scribes and Lawyers amongst the *Jews*, and denounces these hearty Woes against — Mat. 23. 4. and Mark 7. *Woe unto you, Scribes, Pharisees, and Hypocrites. And for what Reasons; because they laid heavy Burthens on Mens Shoulders, and taught for Doctrines* (for Divine Precepts) *the Commandments of Men*: Made those Things sinful, which God had not made so; and pretended his Authority in Matters, which he had left indifferent. Which is nothing less than *Imposture*, where the Religion of the Father, the common Reason of Mankind, and the Revelation of his Son is silent; there we ought to be silent also: and not teach what we have not received, lest we be found *Lyars*. For it is a less Crime, to command what he does not require, than to forbid, and teach Men not to do what he has commanded: For his Authority is equally condemn'd in both. But our Lord says, Mat. 5. 19. *that he who does the one, shall be least in the Kingdom of Heaven*. When then shall we plead in Excuse for the other? But if this be done upon private Views, or to serve a Turn, What can be greater Presumption and Hypocrisy?

crisy? Ignorance may extenuate some Errors; but this is a direct Contempt of God.

I will not say the Matter in hand has any Marks of Hypocrisie; nor can I say it has any Marks of Charity: For to fill up the Interstices of Sense, and Periods, otherwise void of Meaning, with odious Characters, and invidious Suggestions and Insinuations, never happens for want of Malice and Prejudice.

The Persons suppos'd to *drink this Health*, never thought Criminal, however Unseasonable before, are not only charg'd with Hypocrisie and Impiety in the most aggravating Terms; they are also represented as the most Factious, Disloyal, Rebellious Part of God's Creation; *Tho' they prove themselves of one Communion, i. e. of the Establish'd Church; yet are said to speak, and act through their whole Life in Favour of another; to write and expose it on all Occasions, and to run into all Measures for the Encouragement and Support of Separation.* If they honour the Memory of *K. W — m*, and erect Statues to him, *who can tell but 'tis with a disloyal and factious Design.* And the Thought is so natural that, People cannot help imagining that this is adoring dead Kings, by Way of rebelling against the Living.

I would ask a Man of ordinary Sense, and common Honesty, what could be said worse of them, had they been every Day convicted of Riots and Treacherous Correspondencies? Had they been noted for seditious Practises, and obstructing the common Course of Justice, had they form'd Dangerous Designs against the State, daily excite Mobs, and publickly outrag'd the Laws?

But what, in God's Name, are the real and unfeigned Crimes of these Men? And who are they? Why truly they are none other than the whole Protestant Body of the Nation, High and Low, Rich and Poor, Old and Young, (except a Few born since 1688, and a few more, who have no hopes but in new Revolutions.) And their great Crime is, I dare speak it out, that

that as other good Christians, they sometimes meet together, to enjoy themselves according to the Council of the *Wise Man*: To rejoice in that Security and Happiness they now possess *under the Best of QUEENS*. And when thus met together, they never forget Those, to whom under God they owe All; but from the Bottom of their Hearts drink the *Queen's Health*, and after that perhaps to the *Glorious Memory of K. William*, sometimes comparing their present Sun-shine with the Clouds and Darkness of 1688. what Hardships many of 'em suffer'd, and what Dangers and Ruin then hung over them all: Or, being provoked with the Contumelious Terms of *Presbyterians* and *Whiggs*; which then, they very well remember, were of the same Signification with *Protestants* and *Hereticks*, and promiscuously us'd by the *Popish Rabble*. Which is another Aggravation of their Guilt, they repeat, or perhaps join these Two Healths together, in a prophane Imitation of the plain Primitive Christians; who, when reproach'd and divided by the *Infidels*, for worshipping a *Crucify'd Saviour*, lifted up their Hands in the Form of a Cross, (not concealing it with *Popish Superstition* or Policy in their Bosoms,) to shew to all World they were not ashamed of what they ador'd. This is the perpetual, noisy, clamorous Sounding of the Praises of a *Dead Monarch*, which his Lordship upbraids them with, as having a Semblance at least of sacrificing to his Ghost. And which, he says, must have a malignant Influence upon the Loyalty of unwary Subjects (I hope he does not speak experimentally) and naturally dispose them to Faction and Sedition. He knows that Matter best, and therefore I will make no other Reply to this, and all other Suggestions of the same Kind, so artfully interspers'd up and down this whole Discourse; than what was found written on a Bundle of Papers, as 'tis said, in the Study of the late good Archbishop Tillotson; *These are all Libels, God forgive 'em*.